

# Pope Benedict XVI on the Priesthood and Homosexuality

**Fr. Brian Mullady, O.P., S.T.D.**

*Fr. Mullady is an adjunct professor of moral theology at Holy Apostles College and Seminary, Cromwell, Connecticut. He can be reached at FrBMullady@aol.com.*

---

## Abstract

*In his recent interview published as the book *Light of the World*, Pope Benedict XVI noted that the Vatican has repeatedly stated that men with a homosexual orientation should not be admitted to the priesthood even if they performed no homosexual acts. He stated that he did not want celibacy to be an excuse to attract people with a homosexual orientation. There are several reasons for this stance.*

*The priesthood is not a denial of the spousal meaning of the body which underlies marriage. This spousal meaning entails the fact that since man is a composite of body and spirit, the body is the physical self by which the gift of the soul which characterizes married love is finally ratified. The giving and receiving of sperm and ova expresses physically the prior giving and receiving of soul. This gift of self to another, for those who are called to it, can also be realized by the gift of self to God as is the case with virgins and religious.*

*Though celibacy is a discipline, because of the all-encompassing concentration of forces necessary for the priesthood, realized especially in the consecration of the Eucharist, it is a fit means for carrying out this spousal meaning of the body. As a result, a priest must have the same ability to give the gift of himself totally as a married man does; only his gift is to the whole Church.*

*There is an argument as to whether homosexuality is a result of nurture or nature. In either case, as long as this condition remains, the total dedication of self required of the priest would not be possible. If this is the result of nature, this cannot be changed;*

*and the person could not contemplate a priestly vocation. If this results from nurture, then it could be changed; in which case after a person has changed it, he could pursue the priesthood.*

## The Problem

The crisis in the priesthood regarding the abuse of children is related to a deeper problem: Is the priestly vocation compatible with homosexual tendencies? This crisis is characterized by an overwhelming preponderance of abuse of teenage boys. Not all abuse is pedophilia. The online encyclopedia *Wikipedia* explains:

*In Sexual Addiction and Compulsivity: The Journal of Treatment and Prevention*, Cimboic and Cartor (2006) noted that because of the large share of post-pubescent male minors among cleric victims there is need to further study the differential variables related to ephebophile versus pedophile offenders. Cartor, Cimboic, and Tallon (2008) found that 6 percent of the cleric offenders in the John Jay report are pedophiles, 32 percent ephebophiles, 15 percent 11- and 12-year-olds only (both male and female), 20 percent indiscriminate, and 27 percent mildly indiscriminate. They also found distinct differences between the pedophile and ephebophile groups.<sup>1</sup>

Ephebophilia as opposed to pedophilia is a preferential attraction for youth between about eleven and fourteen or about the age of puberty. It involves a significantly different psychological profile which includes the higher probability of cure than pedophilia. Not only that, but many experts believe that gay culture leads more easily to ephebophilia; and so this would make consideration of actual or deep-seated homosexuality an important consideration for a priestly vocation.

Pope Benedict has addressed this issue in his interview published in the book *Light of the World*, by Ignatius Press. Though the text is lengthy it is worth quoting in its entirety.

Sexuality has an intrinsic meaning and direction which is not homosexual. The meaning and direction of sexuality is to bring about the union of man and woman and in this way give humanity posterity, children, future. This is the determination internal to the essence of sexuality. Everything else is against sexuality's intrinsic meaning and direction. This is a point we need to hold firm, even if it is not pleasing to our age.

The issue at stake here is the intrinsic truth of sexuality's significance in the constitution of man's being. If someone has deep-seated homosexual inclinations—and it is still an open question whether these inclinations are really innate or they arise in early childhood—if, in any case, they have power over him this is a great trial for him, just as other trials conflict other people as well. But this does not mean that homosexuality thereby becomes morally right. Rather it remains contrary to the essence of what God originally willed.

Homosexuality is incompatible with the priestly vocation. Otherwise, celibacy itself would lose its meaning as a renunciation. It would be extremely dangerous if celibacy became a sort of pretext for bringing people into the priesthood who don't want to get married anyway. For, in the end, their attitude toward man or woman is somehow distorted, off-center, and, in any case, is not within the direction of creation of which we have spoken. The Congregation for Education issued a decision a few years ago to the effect that homosexual candidates cannot become priests because their sexual orientation estranges them from the proper sense of paternity, from the intrinsic nature of priestly being. The selection of candidates to the priesthood must therefore be very careful. The greatest attention is needed here in order to prevent the intrusion of this kind of ambiguity and to head off a situation where the celibacy of priests would practically end up being identified with the tendency to homosexuality.

Well, that is just one of the miseries of the Church (homosexuality in the clergy). And the persons who are affected must at least try not to express this inclination actively, in order to remain true to the intrinsic mission of their office.<sup>2</sup>

In this article, I would like to examine why this is the case. I will first examine the nature and cause of priestly celibacy and then the healthy psychological profile which should be the foundation for anyone who wishes to join the priesthood. This will be based on Catholic moral theology as I am not a psychiatrist. I will then seek to show why homosexual development cannot be a proper foundation for living this life, even if a person is not practicing homosexual acts and then give some examination of prevention or cure for this condition. I realize that there is a lot of argument over whether homosexuality results from nurture or nature. I suspect that in most cases it is nurture, though nature may cause this case in some. If it is nurture, it should be able to be changed.

Let it also be said at the outset that whatever moral analysis will be made in this article addresses the objective issues of sexuality and not the moral responsibility of the person who suffers from a homosexual orientation unless this is in their control. There is no judgment made on the person who may suffer this inclination unless they indulge in homosexual acts, which are intrinsically evil, or willingly participate in the gay culture.

## **The Nature of Priestly Celibacy**

In the mid-1970s and the 80s there was an interpretation of priestly celibacy which maintained that it was simply a condition of not being married but did not rule out dating or even sexual activity, homosexual or heterosexual. Not only is this interpretation quite superficial, but it completely misses the point of priestly celibacy.

Priestly celibacy is one form of the affirmation of what Pope John Paul II calls "spousal love" in his talks on *Theology of the Body*.<sup>3</sup> In these

talks, the pope explains that the original nature of marriage is based on what he calls the “spousal” or “nuptial” meaning of the body. When Adam names the animals, he finds that he is alone among material creation. John Paul II calls this, the “original solitude.” God says that it is not good for Adam to be alone because he is made in the image and likeness of God and God is not alone. The three persons in God spend all of eternity doing nothing but giving and receiving each other in knowledge and love. From Adam’s rib, God creates Eve. When Adam sees Eve, he gives the first great cry of joy in the history of the human race and speaks the first wedding song: “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh, she shall be called woman because she has been taken out of man” (Gn 2:23). Eve receives this recognition and returns it.

This recognition is made not only in soul, but also through the body. The two then become one flesh, and that unity occurs because the body is a means to ratify the already existing gift of soul which they have given to each other. The spiritual gift of their hearts in their communion of persons in knowledge and love is completed in the giving and receiving of the human sperm and ova, in life. The body is a vehicle for the giving of the soul. The pope states that this gift accords with the nature of personhood as defined in Vatican II, *Gaudium et spes*, number 24.<sup>4</sup> This is ethically expressed in two ways: 1) no person may be an object of use, every person must be a subject of love; 2) a person only finds himself in a sincere gift of himself to another. This is the original character of sexuality. The spiritual dimension is more important than the physical, and determines it. The body however is intimately involved in man in this gift of self.

In the original experience of man, the body was really a vehicle of this communion; and the passions were all completely and spontaneously integrated with the intellect and will. There was no lust. “They were naked and not ashamed” (Gn 2:25). John Paul II calls this the “original nakedness.”

Marriage and the marital act both revolve around this freedom of the parties to give themselves to each other, a moral freedom which includes the responsibility to procreate children and the freedom from manipulation and extortion of the gift of self of the other. The responsibility for the procreation of children comes from the very nature of the giving of human sperm and ova which always has an ethical meaning. Though the parties come together spiritually, since man is not an angel but has a body which is good, God has chosen this means to propagate the human race so that heaven may be peopled with those enjoying Him. The sperm and the ova are necessary parts of this because their union is the means God has chosen to provide the material basis for the creation of the soul. The gift of persons forms the foundation for a great natural friendship which is founded on the relationship of the parties to each other in the context of giving and receiving the physical sperm and ova.

If one seeks to divorce this and parenting from the giving of life physically, this is to suggest that the gift of the sperm and ova and its reception

and the gift of hearts and their reception have only a tenuous relationship to one another. This would be to affirm a Platonic or Cartesian theory of the relationship of the soul to the body which at best sees them as peripheral to one another and at worst in opposition to each other. John Paul II explains why this is, and it is worth quoting at length here.

At this point the true meaning of the natural law can be understood: it refers to man's proper and primordial nature, the "nature of the human person," which is *the person himself in the unity of soul and body*, in the unity of his spiritual and biological inclinations and of all the other specific characteristics necessary for the pursuit of his end. "The natural moral law expresses and lays down the purposes, rights, and duties which are based upon the bodily and spiritual nature of the human person. Therefore this law cannot be thought of as simply a set of norms on the biological level; rather it must be defined as the rational order whereby man is called by the Creator to direct and regulate his life and actions and in particular to make use of his own body." To give an example, the origin and the foundation of the duty of absolute respect for human life are to be found in the dignity proper to the person and not simply in the natural inclination to preserve one's own physical life. Human life, even though it is a fundamental good of man, thus acquires a moral significance in reference to the good of the person, who must always be affirmed for his own sake. While it is always morally illicit to kill an innocent human being, it can be licit, praiseworthy or even imperative to give up one's own life (cf. Jn 15:13) out of love of neighbor or as a witness to the truth. Only in reference to the human person in his "unified totality," that is, as "a soul which expresses itself in a body and a body informed by an immortal spirit," can the specifically human meaning of the body be grasped. Indeed, natural inclinations take on moral relevance only insofar as they refer to the human person and his authentic fulfillment, a fulfillment which for that matter can take place always and only in human nature. By rejecting all manipulations of corporeity which alter its human meaning, the Church serves man and shows him the path of true love, the only path on which he can find the true God.<sup>5</sup>

All attempts to divorce the use of the sperm and ova from the bringing forth of children do not correspond to the glory of the union of soul and body in sexuality. They are objectively sinful. Such a sin is homosexuality, because neither procreation and education nor the proper union which revolves around this love can be experienced by the parties. Homosexual acts and homosexual marriage are contrary to both the natural and the divine laws. They are gravely evil.

### **Proper Psychological Structure for Marriage**

The psychological structure which must be the basis for maturely entering into marriage must reflect the ability to give oneself as a gift in this context. The tendency to divorce the body from the soul in free

human actions is also seen in the tendency to confuse or divorce love in the will from love in the passions. Love is found in both. This love is an attraction which is based on an “affinity” (Thomas Aquinas uses the word “*complacentia*” to describe this). In man, this love is primarily experienced in a movement of the will to affirm the other thing as good. This is the kind of love we have for God and neighbor. This is volitional love.

Volitional love has many characteristics. It is generous. One can will the good to another even if one is indifferent or has an aversion to the other based on a perceived possible evil. Volitional love cannot be understood by reference to our sensible passions. This is because it is based on the universal idea of the good.

As the pope points out in his analysis of “original nakedness,” this volitional love is not enough for virtuous formation in love. Since man has a body, it must be completed in sensuous or emotional love. This emotional love is formed as an expression of the volitional love approving the good of another in generosity; and when the two unite, volitional and sensuous love produce maturity and integrity. John Paul II says, in this experience, *eros* (sensuous love) and *ethos* (volitional love) exist in happy combination. In fact, the original meaning of *eros* was an attraction to another thing which led one outside oneself in ecstasy.

Since the original sin, this mature attraction has become compromised, not destroyed. Relations between man and woman are characterized by “original shame” according to John Paul II. St. Augustine reflects this. “For him [Augustine], the overriding tendency to iniquity was that powerful substitute for sex which is the peculiar prerogative of the spiritually minded, ‘the desire to dominate.’”<sup>6</sup>

Christ frees us from this domination by giving grace back to us, but the tendency which is lust still remains in us. Christ does not indict the body or the senses in themselves but the will. He calls on man to rediscover the meaning of his body as the virtuous substratum in which he can again give the gift of himself. He calls on man to allow him to redeem his body through grace and to return to a condition in which *eros* and *ethos* are reunited through *agape* (charity and grace).

Christ adds another purpose to the original spousal meaning of marriage in the sacrament of the New Testament. Marriage is now not just a sign of the union of the persons of the Trinity, but is also a sign of Christ as head of the Church who gave his body for the life of the Church so that the two might be one in the sacrifice of the cross. This is reflected in Ephesians 5:21–33.

This character of the passions, including those connected to marriage, should be governed by reason. This is the natural condition of reason in which man finds his integrity. The governance of reason does not mean the suppression of the passions by reason. So there must be a middle ground between merely giving into passions and destroying them. One must humanize them by self-restraining love.

For the mature experience of love, one must then be formed not to fear the passions or the pleasures connected with sexuality, but also to restrain one's use of them according to the order of reason. So reason has both a negative and a positive function here. The negative function is restraining our passions in prudence. The positive one is developing the passions according to the nature of marriage. One must learn unselfish and generous love, and this proceeds and is the foundation of marriage. This includes both openness to procreation and education, and unity.

A husband and wife bring about each other's existential fulfillment through their unselfish, mature love of each other. True, their mutual love often reaches its climax in the sexual act, provided they give themselves to each other completely without holding back. But the sex act as such is not essential to the perfection of the partners.<sup>7</sup>

Consummation of marriage is not necessary for validity, but it is certainly necessary for the bond to finally take effect in its fullness and is the normal way for this to occur. However, for validity, one must *be able* to consummate the marriage.

### **The Nature of Priestly Celibacy**

Many people think that this spousal character of the body is denied in celibacy. This is what has led to the mistaken idea that celibacy simply means "not being married" but that otherwise anything goes. It is true that celibacy involves an exceptional state when compared with the state of marriage. But this is not a denial of the spousal meaning of the body. Instead, one is affirming it in the manner in which the spousal meaning of the body will be realized in heaven. There "they neither marry nor are given in marriage" (Mt 22:30). All of the psychological formation for generous love and self-restraint which forms the necessary background of being a husband and father in marriage is also necessary for one who pursues celibacy. The original solitude, which a man experiences, can also be overcome when he is "alone with the alone." This is the case in virginity and also in celibacy. Continence for the kingdom is a renunciation of spousal love as lived in this world, but it is a positive embracing of spousal love as it is lived in the next. Physical sexuality is not the only way to live spousal love. In heaven in fact it will be lived with only spiritual fruitfulness. One must remember that spousal love represented the interpersonal communion of the Trinity in the beginning of the human race and now also includes Christ's love for his Church. Fruitfulness is included in that. The only intention one can have in embracing spousal love is "for the sake of the kingdom of heaven." If this is true for virgins, it is also true for priests whose whole vocation is caught up in living "for the sake of the kingdom of heaven."

Of course, in the history of the Church, it is clear that celibacy has not always been required of the priesthood. It is not today in the Eastern

church and there are some exceptions made for the Western church. The popular history behind this fact has usually maintained that from apostolic times, priests could marry or be celibate, with celibacy recommended. In the ninth century, the Western church required celibacy because of the corruption of the clergy and inheritance problems in the church whereas the Eastern practice was normative and has not changed.

New research has proven that this view of history is not true. The actual history is that from apostolic times a priest could marry or be celibate, with celibacy recommended. However, if a priest married, he had to beget his children before his ordination, as sexual activity and the all-encompassing spiritual energy needed for the consecration of the Eucharist were viewed as incompatible. Both he and his wife had to make a promise not to have sex after he was ordained.<sup>8</sup>

In 692 A.D., the Quinsext Council of Trullo, a local council in the Eastern church modified this practice and allowed married priests to have sex and celebrate the Eucharist. However, the weight of the tradition was still in favor of limiting sexual activity—this council also decreed that on the day after a priest and his wife had sex he could not celebrate the Eucharist. It also decreed that bishops must be celibate as they exercise the fullness of the priestly order. So the episcopal office was reserved to monks.

Why is this the case? The reason is because of the total spiritual concentration of forces needed to celebrate the Eucharist. In the Eucharist, the priest does not act as the individual whose name is on his passport. He does not act *in persona ministri* (in the person of the minister) but *in persona Christi capitis* (in the Person of Christ the Head of the Church).

And yet priestly character would seem to demand, by its very dignity and the charism it constitutes, a perpetual disposition on the part of the recipient to always render present, *in actu*, for the benefit of all the Church, that for which the gift of Orders is given. In other words, there would seem to be an almost “connatural” requirement on the part of the ordinand to correspond to the gift of Order being received through personal consecration of body and soul to God, with its obligation of living in perfect chastity.<sup>9</sup>

Interestingly enough this same confirmation that celibacy is psychologically much more fitting to the total consecration necessary to perform transubstantiation comes from a source not friendly to Catholicism, Richard Krafft-Ebing.

The well-known German psychiatrist Richard Krafft-Ebing stated in his *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886): “It shows a masterly knowledge of human nature that the Roman Catholic Church enjoins celibacy upon its priests in order to emancipate them from sensuality, and to concentrate their entire activity in pursuit of their calling.”<sup>10</sup>



## **Positive and Negative Psychological Preparation for the Priesthood**

The same formation which should accompany spouses entering marriage is necessary for the mature embracing of celibacy on the part of the priest because the same spousal love is involved. Though because there is no natural support for the surrendering of spousal love after the manner of this world for the same love after the manner of the next world, this also presupposes a deep formation in grace.

For both husbands and priests, the development of a generous love in which there is not a concentration on the genital aspects of sexuality is essential. For the priest this will depend on two factors. First, this generous love, as is the case in marriage must not repress the passions and feelings connected with sexuality as though they were evil in themselves nor give in to them in a self-centered and sinful way. Rather, these must be ennobled by self-restraining love. Through self-control one begins to understand that sexuality is primarily about spiritual communion and unselfish giving of the self to another. The more one denies using the other just to gratify pleasure, the more one concentrates on discovering the mystery of the personality of the other as a good which, if blessed by the marital commitment, would naturally result in confirming the communion of souls with the communion of bodies. The soul become one in love, and so the two become one flesh.

Second, the formation experience of the priest or religious which is determined by the schedule, rules, professors, and staff at the seminary or novitiate must address these concerns in such a way that normal relationships to the same and opposite sexes are encouraged. In other words, one must not be forced to repress one's feelings simply from fear nor be allowed to indulge them through sexual acts, even acts of self-abuse. If the person undergoing this formation can develop the ability to deny his self-gratification for the sake of higher and deeper goods, his relationship with God and his service of the Church, then the celibate can develop the noble and generous interior life which alone can support the sacrifice of genital sexuality. One psychiatrist has stated the matter well.

Priests and celibates generally have neither more nor less sexual difficulties than married men. . . . It is still a question of turning from love of self to love of another. Indeed, to be a good priest or celibate requires as much masculine maturity and the same qualities as to be a good husband and father. If either one experiences his genital sexuality as the main focus of interest and concern, that very fact is an indication that he has failed to bring his lower faculties under the control of reason. As a result, he will tend to relate to another as an object of self-gratification or utility but not as a person worthy of love. Consequently, in both states of life a man must practice restraining love that controls but does not repress the legitimate longing to love and to be loved.<sup>11</sup>

One further point must be emphasized. The priest should have a functional love for everyone. For one thing, the fact that he has given the spousal meaning of his body to God means that he should have a spiritual fatherhood which includes both intellectual and emotional affirmation for everyone. This does not mean he should have a personal love for everyone, but that he should be accessible as Our Lord was. This functional love would be a volitional love, but it would also stimulate feelings of compassion, affection, and kindness.

This is not enough though. Like everyone the priest needs to also be loved for himself alone and not just for his service to others. So the priest also needs friends. To be able to develop a self-restraining love regarding friends is important too. Expressions of affection which would be considered inappropriate should a third party enter the room must not be done. By learning to restrain the time and concentration one spends on the friend, the priest can experience authentic freedom in love and also begin to experience what loving God is like. St. Therese used to say that God treated her like his little ball. Sometimes he threw her up and enjoyed her, and she him. At other times he left her sitting in the corner. She had to learn how to appreciate both, because obsessive friendships which are more relationships of co-dependency are destructive for both friends. This is especially true for the priest if the friendship is with a woman.

As to the homosexual acts, they are evil and cannot be justified for any reason, because neither procreation nor real unity revolving around the sexual act—which includes procreation—can take place. They are examples of co-dependency. The problem is whether a person with a homosexual tendency can have any real friendship with another as long as this homosexual tendency persists. Are all his relationships co-dependent in such a way that he is incapable of experiencing generous love? The answer to this lies in the nature and possible cure of homosexual tendencies.

As Pope Benedict pointed out in his interview, the jury is still out on whether homosexuality is caused by nature or nurture. There is at least enough evidence that nurture causes or contributes to it to ask the place of nurture in the act. In either case, homosexual individuals often exhibit serious emotional, behavioral, and sexual problems.<sup>12</sup> This may stem from intense weakness in masculine confidence that is associated with strong feelings of loneliness and sadness. This insecurity interferes with male bonding and forming secure same-sex attachments. Psychologically, there may be a lack of healthy male physical aggressiveness, emotional instability or immaturity, an underdeveloped psychic maleness.<sup>13</sup> Frequently, this implies softness to self; lack of firmness and perseverance; a need to please or get attention; unsuitability for exerting authority and guiding people; self-centeredness, oversensitivity, neurotic and relational problems. It has been posited that homosexuals are characterized by a self-pitying attitude which leads to an inferiority complex and difficulty asserting their masculinity.<sup>14</sup> These feelings of

inferiority and self-pity can lead to self-pampering in such exercises as masturbation which in turn weakens the will further because the person is treating himself as an object of use for pleasure and thus demeaning himself in his own eyes. Homosexuals often hunger for attention which they channel in various ways; they are often ego-centered; their non-sexual relating is infantile, including with their parents; they preserve adolescent attitudes towards the opposite sex such as boys feeling inferior in front of women; they cannot accept their gender identity; and this experience is just part of a total personality whose other side is that of an adult.<sup>15</sup>

The real issue regarding the priesthood is whether a person in this condition is capable of the surrender of sensuality and egotism which is demanded in the priesthood. Priests are still looked upon as power figures. Someone with these characteristics might use his position easily to satisfy his desire for love in inappropriate ways, even without sexual activity with another person. The cordiality and freedom which should characterize the priest in the noble appreciation of his vocation would be almost impossible for someone in this condition while it lasted. The domination of the inner life by the inner self-pitying child and the inner fantasy life which result in self-pampering would make it extremely unlikely that such a person could participate in any realistic way in either the consecration of the priesthood or the universal cordiality which go hand in hand with this vocation. As long as this orientation endures, the priesthood would not seem to be a possibility; and that is true even without the sexual acts.

However, this does not mean that someone who has developed this condition as a result of adolescence could not pursue the priesthood if they were cured. Many therapists maintain that this condition is a result of nurture and can be changed. Some techniques for this are hyper dramatizing the self-pity of the inner child so that it becomes funny. Self-knowledge of one's weakness and exaggerating it can lead easily to seeing the comic side which instantly allows a person to let go of these feelings. This coupled with a religious conversion which is not just pure will but includes a gradual healing of the passions could lead the person to the surrender necessary to let go of this self-pity and let the more noble self enter. When one realizes that the whole human race is in the same boat of moral weakness, that he should not idolize the strength of others, and that only Christ can truly heal him, then the road of hope is open to developing the soil which could eventually become the fertile ground on which to develop the priestly heart.

But to do this one must fight one's infantile tendencies. With self-knowledge, patience, and a sense of humor, this is often possible. When this occurs, then it is possible for one to grow in the development of the ability to freely give and receive love without demanding continuous proofs. Then one can truly become what Dr. Conrad Baars calls, in one of his articles, "A Priest for All Seasons, Masculine and Celibate."<sup>16</sup>

---

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> *Wikipedia*, s.v. “Catholic sex abuse cases,” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic\\_sex\\_abuse\\_cases](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_sex_abuse_cases).
- <sup>2</sup> Pope Benedict XVI, *Light of the World: The Pope, the Church and the Signs of the Times*, trans. Michael J. Miller and Adrian J. Walker (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 1501–1503.
- <sup>3</sup> Pope John Paul II, *Male and Female He Created Them*, trans. Michael Waldstein (Boston: Pauline Books, 2006).
- <sup>4</sup> Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et spes*, n. 24: “For having been created in the image of God, Who ‘from one man has created the whole human race and made them live all over the face of the earth’ (Acts 17:26), all men are called to one and the same goal, namely God Himself.”
- <sup>5</sup> John Paul II, *Veritatis splendor* (1993), n. 50, original emphasis, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_enc\\_06081993\\_veritatis-splendor\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_06081993_veritatis-splendor_en.html).
- <sup>6</sup> Aelred Squire, *Asking the Fathers* (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1993), 41.
- <sup>7</sup> Jordan Aumann, O.P., and Conrad Baars, *The Unquiet Heart* (New York: Alba House, 1991), 153.
- <sup>8</sup> Roman Cholij, *Clerical Celibacy in East and West* (Hereford, England: Gracewing, 1989), *passim*.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 202.
- <sup>10</sup> Aumann and Baars, *The Unquiet Heart*, 156.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.
- <sup>12</sup> See, in this issue, Richard Fitzgibbons and Dale O’Leary, “Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Clergy,” *Linacre Quarterly* 78 (2011): 273–293.
- <sup>13</sup> See, in this issue, Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg, “On the Psychogenesis of Homosexuality,” *Linacre Quarterly* 78 (2011): 330–355.
- <sup>14</sup> Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg, *On the Origins and Treatment of Homosexuality* (New York: Praeger, 1986), 80.
- <sup>15</sup> Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg, *Homosexuality and Hope* (Ann Arbor MI: Servant Books, 1985), 75–78.
- <sup>16</sup> Conrad Baars, “A Priest for All Seasons, Masculine and Celibate,” in *idem*, *I Will Give Them a New Heart*, eds. Suzanne Baars and Bonnie N. Shayne (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 2007).